



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/531,005	03/20/2000	Chun-Geun Choi	P56011	6332

7590 10/03/2002

Robert E Bushnell  
Suite 300 1522 K Street NW  
Washington, DC 20005-1202

EXAMINER

JOSEPH, THOMAS J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/531,005

Applicant(s)

CHOI ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas J Joseph

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 March 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract contains more than one paragraph. Further, line 4 of the said abstract reading, "... apparatus has is stored" is unclear and cannot be comprehended by one with ordinary skill in the art.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 – 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurtenbach et al (US 6,414,700) and Foster (US 6,211,870).

**Claim 1:**

Kurtenbach teaches use of a GUI for operating hotkeys (col. 1, lines 45 – 60). This GUI corresponding to hotkeys translates into a video display control apparatus having hotkeys for a user to invoke and control functions associated with the video apparatus, said function is represented by a menu item from an OSD menu, along with said video display control apparatus. The use of computerized hotkeys inherently teach using a memory unit coupled to the button unit, and adapted for storing information concerning OSD menu items. Further, the said computerized hotkeys inherently teach a button unit comprising a hotkey button adapted for generating a key signal corresponding to a menu item on an OSD menu. The use of the said computerized hotkeys inherently teach a control unit for receiving said key signal from said button unit; for reading information concerning an OSD menu item stored in the memory unit, when said key signal is received; and for thereupon sending a control signal to the video display apparatus to control a function thereof. Kurtenbach fail to teach an OSD unit for outputting an OSD character display signal to a video processing unit in response to a said key signal, whereby actuation by a user of said hotkey button causes a screen display of one or more OSD characters. However, Kurtenbach does allude to the need for specific personalize hotkeys by proposing a GUI with numerous operations accessible with a minimum number of cursor selections.

Foster teaches an editing system wherein the user can essentially create a customized hotkey (col. 10, lines 55 – 65). This customization allows the user to actuate a personal hotkey while causing the screen to display one or more OSD characters. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to combine the hotkey actuations taught by Foster with the GUI coupled with hotkeys taught by Kurtenbach. Doing so gives the user greater flexibility in establishing personalized hotkeys.

**Claim 2:**

Kurtenbach teaches a video display control apparatus wherein the OSD menu displays one or more OSD menu item on the screen of the video display apparatus (fig. 1).

**Claim 3:**

Foster teaches a method for a user to program personal hotkeys. Such a method is a detector for determining whether present-time information corresponds to an OSD menu item selected at a present time is identical to past-time information corresponding to an OSD menu item and already stored in the memory unit. Further, the present-time information is not identical to said past-time information, for enabling storage of said present-time information in the memory unit.

**Claim 4:**

Kurtenbach fails to teach a video display control apparatus wherein said function of a video display apparatus is selected from the following group: audio mute, audio volume control, screen position, screen contrast, screen brightness, color, and tint. Foster teaches a video display control apparatus wherein said function of a video display apparatus is selected from the following group: audio mute, audio volume control, screen position, screen contrast, screen brightness, color, and tint (fig. 7). The figure provides a specific mute key. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the invention to combine the: audio mute, audio volume control, screen position, screen contrast, screen brightness, color, or tint controller taught by Foster with the GUI coupled with hotkeys taught by Kurtenback. Doing so gives the user the ability to customize video and audio output control keys.

**Claim 5, 6, and 7:**

Kurtenback and Foster teach the rationale for claims 5, 6, and 7 in rejected claim

1.

**Conclusion**

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J Joseph whose telephone number is 703-305-3917. The examiner can normally be reached Mondays through Fridays from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

tjj  
September 26, 2002

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100